Gendered and Sexualized Figurations of Security

Darcy Leigh and Cynthia Weber

Introduction

Figurations are distillations of shared meanings in words or images (Haraway, 1997) that reply upon multiple, contested and often contradictory understandings of what get called sexes, genders and sexualities to make sense of and secure the world. As we outline in this chapter, gendered and sexualized figurations are implicitly and explicitly drawn upon in security theory and practice. Because gendered and sexualized figurations of security participate in the organization, regulation and conduct of international security, security scholars and practitioners need clear theoretical and methodological frameworks to help them identify and analyze gendered and sexualized figurations.

In this chapter, we first introduce one such theoretical and methodological framework to identify and analyze gendered and sexualized figurations. This framework draws heavily on Donna Haraway's conceptionalization of figuration in the context of Feminist Techoscience Studies and its employment by Cynthia Weber (2016) in the context of *Queer International Relations*. In the second section, we put this framework to work in relation to three empirical examples of gendered and sexualized figurations. These empirical examples illustrate: (1) how figurations of security are gendered as masculine and feminine and are embodied in the imagined figures of men and women; (2) how figurations of security are sexualized as heterosexual or

homosexual[1] and attached to a range of sexualized understandings of perverse and normal figurations; and (3) how figurations of security are geomorphized as inanimate, nonhuman, geological or environmental sexed, gendered and sexualized figurations of security.

Figuration as a Theoretical and Methodological Approach to Gendered and Sexualized Security Studies

Donna Haraway's understanding of figuration as the distillation of shared meanings in forms or images is used by a wide range of feminist and queer studies scholars as a critical conceptual devise (Kuntsman, 2009:29). In this section, we explain Haraway's notion of figuration. In the next section, we will apply her ideas to sexed, gendered and sexualized figurations of security.

Haraway explains figuration as the employment of semiotic tropes that combine knowledges, practices, and power to (in)form how we map our worlds and understand the actual things in those worlds (1997).[2] Unpacking Haraway's description, we are

[1] Heterosexual and homosexual do not exhaust the wide range of existing potential expressions of sexuality, just as male and female or masculine and feminine do not exhaust the range of sexes or genders. We examine these expressions of sexes, genders, and sexualities in our analysis because these are the dominant expressions used at the moment in figurations of security.

[2] Our explanation of Haraway condenses and paraphrases longer discussions by Cynthia Weber (2016).

left with four key elements through which figurations take specific forms: tropes, temporalities, performativities, and worldings (1997:11).

Tropes are material and semiotic expressions of actual things that express how we understand those actual things. Whether they take linguistic, artistic or visual form, for example, tropes are akin to figures of speech that are not "literal or self-identical" to what they describe (Haraway, 1997:11). Figures of speech enable us to express what something or someone is *like* while (potentially) at the same time grasping that the figuration is not identical to the figure of speech we have employed. This is what allows figuration to be something that both makes representation appear to be possible and interrupts representation in any literal sense. For no matter how much textual, visual or artistic languages may strive to literally represent something, they always involve "at least some kind of displacement that can trouble identifications and certainties" (Haraway, 1997:11) between a figuration and an actual thing.

Haraway's second element of figuration is temporalities. Temporality expresses a relationship to time. Haraway notes that figurations are historically rooted in progressive, eschatological temporality because they are embedded within "the semiotics of Western Christian realism". Because Western Christian figurations hold the promise of salvation in the afterlife, they embody this progressive temporality (Haraway, 1997:9). This medieval notion of developmental temporality persists as a vital aspect of (some) contemporary figurations, even when contemporary figurations take secular forms (e.g., when it is science, not God, that promises to deliver us from evil through technological innovation [Haraway, 1997:10] and when they employ developmental time in a variety of ways). Expanding Haraway's use of temporalities

in relation to figurations, Weber (2016) and our analysis below show that temporalities can take far more forms in relation to figurations, with Haraway's understanding of Western Christian developmental temporalities being just one illustration.

Haraway's third element of figuration is performativities. Coined by Judith Butler to explain how sexes, genders and sexualities appear to be normal, natural and true, the term performativity expresses how repeated iterations of acts constitute the subjects who are said to be performing them (Butler, 1999:xv). Applying Nietzsche's idea that there is no doer behind the deed and that the deed is everything (1999:33) to an analysis of sexes, genders and sexualities, Butler argues that enactments of gender make it appear as if sex – which Butler understands as a social construct – is natural and normal, and as if particular sexed bodies map "naturally" onto particular genders. It is through the everyday inhabiting of these various sexes, genders and sexualities by everyday "doers" who performatively enact them that the subjectivities of these doers of sex, gender and sexuality appear to come into being. As we will suggest in the next section, these 'doers' or subjectivities are understood in a multitude of ways. They may be animate (humans) subjectivities, inanimate (non-human) subjectivities, or even a mix of animate and inanimate subjectivities.

Once enacted, performativities do not freeze sexed, gendered and sexualized subjectivities and what Foucault (1978) describes as the networks of power and pleasure which are productive of subjectivities. Rather, because each enactment is itself particular, it holds the possibility of reworking, rewiring and resisting both

"frozen" notions of sex, gender and sexuality and their institutionalized organizations of power.

Following Butler, Haraway argues that "[f]igurations are performative images that can be inhabited" (Haraway, 1997:11). These figurations are never stable. For every performance of a figuration depends upon innumerable particularities, including: historical circumstances, geopolitical context, spatial location, social/psychic/affective/political dispositions as well as perceived/attributed traits (racial, sexual, classed, gendered, [dis]abled) of individuals in relation to the figurations they are presumed to inhabit, an individual's success, failure or jamming of their assigned/assumed figuration as they performatively enact it, and how these performativities are received and read by others. Because no two performative enactments are ever identical (Butler, 1999), every repetition and inhabitation introduces some, even tiny, amount of difference. What this means is that figurations are never completely frozen, for they are always only distilled forms or images that change – even in small ways – through their every iteration and inhabitation. Therefore, institutional arrangements of, for example, sexed, gendered and sexualized securities are likewise less stable than they appear to be.

All of these aspects of performativity – in combination with how tropes and temporalities are deployed – combine to produce the final element of figuration – worlding (in IR, see Agathangelou and Ling, 2004). Worlding refers to the ways we imagine and try to represent the world through the figurations we have conjured up. As noted earlier, figurations are not representations. They do not represent the world because there is never an identical fit between a figuration and an actual thing, much

less a fit with the whole world itself. What this means for Haraway, then, is that worlding practices are as contestable as the figurations that produce them and are productive of them (1997:11). In their attempts to 'map universes of knowledge, practice, and power' (Haraway, 1997:11), then, worlding practices produce what Haraway calls 'contestable maps' (1997:11) that – like figurations in general – betray how power is mobilized to impose a particular mapping of the world that will never quite correspond to the world itself. It is in these lacks of fit – of figurations to actual doers and of worldings to actual worlds – where resistances to figurations and their worlding practices are often located.

Empirical applications of figuration

In this section, we apply Haraway's notion of figuration to sexed, gendered and sexualized figurations of security. First, we consider how figurations of security are gendered as masculine and feminine and are embodied in the imagined figures of men and women. Second, we describe how figurations of security are sexualized as heterosexual or homosexual and attached to a range of sexualized understandings of perverse and normal figurations. Third, we explore how figurations of security are geomorphized as inanimate, nonhuman, geological or environmental sexed, gendered and sexualized figurations of security. In each case, we show how these figurations take the form of tropes, temporalities, performativities and worldings, as well as outline what investigating gendered, sexed and sexualized figurations of security reveal about security more broadly.

Masculinity and femininity, men and women

Militaries are key sites of figurations of security. The dominant set of gendered tropes at work in the military are of aggressive men protecting peaceful women and of aggressive masculinity deployed to protect peaceful femininity. The Western solider, for example, is regularly figured as a man embodying hegemonic military masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005; Duncanson, 2013). This means he is a strong, aggressive and tough protector of the sovereign nation-state or homefront/homeland against security threats. While this figuration of hegemonic military masculinity is grounded in an imaginary of a particular kind of male soldier, it also circulates beyond the human body: national identity and security policies themselves are regularly imagined as hegemonically masculine (e.g. Cohn, 1987).

In contrast to aggressive male hegemonically masculine protectors, women are regularly figured as "beautiful souls", located in the homeland (Elshtain, 1995). Beautiful souls are those feminine figurations who – because they are imagined as inherently peaceful and nurturing – are figured as in need of protection by men. These women in need of security might be the wives, mothers or daughters of the hegemonically masculine man (or even 'the motherland'). Women who do engage in conflict are therefore often figured as deviant and/or irrational (Gentry and Sjoberg, 2015:20).

These gendered security tropes are racialized. As the Western solider appears in most western hegemonic discourses, for example, he is understood as white. This white man is also often imagined as heterosexual and not disabled. This white heterosexual

and not disabled man must protect white women from racially darkened men and women who are figured as security threats. Similarly, the peaceful nurturing feminine woman is often figured as white. Again, she is figured as heterosexual as well as not disabled. For white women who engage in conflict, their deviance is seen as exceptional (Gentry and Sjoberg, 2015). For racially darkened women, however, violence is often seen as inevitable and as a threat to security in itself.

Progressive developmental temporalities are central to these figurations. While rational white men are imagined as more developed than irrational peaceful or violent white women, white and non-disabled men and women together are figured as more 'civilized' and 'developed' than black and/or disabled figurations. All these figurations are then deployed in the service of white security practices that 'civilize' and 'develop' the 'uncivilized' and 'undeveloped' racially darkened other – or protect the 'civilization' of white society from 'uncivilized' and 'undeveloped' racially darkened security threats. For example, Indigenous societies where women take on more leadership roles are perceived as undeveloped and in need of development, or as threatening the security of settler societies (Allen, 1992; St. Denis, 2007; Emberley, 2001). Similarly, 'oppressed' Muslim women are seen as in need of rescuing from 'unenlightened' Muslim men (Spivak, 1990), which becomes entangled in Western rationales for and practices of war in the middle east, as well as policing of Muslims and other racially darkened populations in Europe and North America.

Once again, however, tracing figurations reveals contingencies and diversity: some figurations are unable to develop and are permanently located 'in the past' within this developmental temporality. The disabled and insane cannot, for example, be civilized.

Nor can they be hegemonically masculine military protectors of the nation. Similarly, Indigenous people and genders are figured as either temporally fixed or, when not fixed, as inauthentically Indigenous. In Indigenous land and self-government claims, for example, Indigenous claimants must demonstrate a relationship with the past, and may not use resources for 'new' purposes, if their claims to those resources are to be judged legitimately 'Indigenous' (Coulthard, 2014; Povinelli, 2015; Leigh, 2014).

The temporalities that underpin these gendered figurations of security not only demonstrate the entanglement of security, gender and sex; they also demonstrate the contingency of figuration. For example, the military masculinities emerging around development, peace and counter-insurgency operations are all arguably different to more conventional military masculinities oriented to combat and conquest (Duncanson, 2013; Cornish, 2015). As figurations of security change, so does the figuration of gender and sexuality.

These tropes and temporalities construct the figuration of the protector of security (the soldier) as a figuration who is most easily (and most often) performatively inhabitable by white, western, abilized men. In the cases of military involvement in sexual exploitation, unchecked aggression against civilians, and extreme torturous violence against 'opponents', we might say that militaries not only embrace hegemonic masculinity but take it to extremes. When women specifically engage in this violence, we might say that women as well as men embrace hegemonic masculinity, refusing the trope of the woman as a beautiful soul (e.g. in Abu Graib). At the same time, however, hegemonic masculinity can only be inhabited by women to a certain degree and in certain ways: women who engage in violence and combat are also seen as

perverse and are denigrated through the tropes of “mothers, monsters and whores” (Gentry and Sjoberg, 2015). Alternatively, in anti-militarist groups like Mothers for Peace in the US or in activism by mothers of veteran and serving soldiers, we can see women embracing the “beautiful soul” and mother tropes. In doing so, these women reaffirm the very tropes which often denigrate them – but do so in ways that arguably subvert the tropes to their own political ends.

These gendered and sexed figurations of security – in the forms of tropes, temporalities and performativities – combine to produce forms of worlding. This worlding, we have shown, is grounded in and underpins racialized, colonizing and patriarchal power relations. In the name of security, this worlding legitimizes and often enacts settler and neo-colonialisms. This is visible when Indigenous women lead Indigenous people in defense of Indigenous lands and state violence against Indigenous people and land is then justified not only in the name of the security of the society, state or economy, but specifically against an underdeveloped threatening and barbaric Indigenous culture in which women are violent and/or leaders (e.g. in the 1999 stand-off between Mohawk and police at Oka, or the 2016 protests against Enbridge Inc’s Northern Gateway oil pipeline – both in Canada). This worlding also legitimizes and enacts ongoing Western military action in the middle east. For example, ‘improper’ gendering and relationships between men and women (‘women’s rights’) were repeatedly evoked to justify the UK invasion of Iraq. This colonial and racist worlding is, we have shown, made visible through an analysis of gendered and sexed figurations of security and is inseparable from those figurations.

Overall, looking at gendered figurations of security in these ways reveals how integral security practices are to constituting gender relations *and* how central gender relations are to constituting security practices. It reveals the multiple forms of power at play in security – from the national and international to the intimate and everyday. Finally, the varied gendered figurations of security described here also demonstrate that gender and security do not map onto each other uniformly. Instead, relationships between gender and security are as diverse as the racialized, abilized and otherwise intersectional figurations which are used to legitimize them.

Heterosexuality and homosexuality, perverse and normal

Gender is inseparable from sexuality. The dominant set of tropes described above – the figurations of aggressive white men protecting peaceful white women and of aggressive masculinity deployed to protect peaceful femininity – are not only understood as gendered but also as sexualized. The security apparatus and nations are imagined as a heterosexual, nuclear family: the father protects wives, mothers and daughters at war; the wives and mothers provide support from home as well as producing and nurturing more soldiers (Peterson, 1999, 2003; Yuval-Davis 1997). These figurations of heterosexual husband soldiers protecting their heterosexual wives are grounded as much in understandings of protecting the homeland/homefront as they are in protecting the heterosexual home, which traditional security narratives figure as the building block of the family, the home, the society, the nation, and the civilization (Peterson, 1999).

In this dominant security narrative, not only does there seem be little room for homosexuals or homosexuality, but security is actively defined in opposition to what get figured as potentially perverse (homo)sexualities. This is particularly the case when sexualities are attached to racially-darkened, disabilized or non(re)productive figurations. So, for example, the trope of the white Western heterosexual solider must, in the name of security, protect the white Western woman and homeland against perverse racially darkened sexualities, as he does in narratives that justify settler-colonialism, war and anti-migration practices (Weber, 2016). Similarly, the white Western heterosexual father must protect the (re)productive potential of the woman, wife, mother and/or motherland.

Developmental temporalities are central to these figurations. The perverse sexualized 'others' who must be saved or protected against by the West in the name of security, are imagined as 'undeveloped' and in need of 'development'. Even the growing recognition of LGBT rights in the West is perceived as evidence of the West's developed and progressive nature in contrast to the underdevelopment of racially-darkened populations. This is the case, for example, when international aid is linked to recognition of aids recipients' legal recognition of LGBT rights, or "gay conditionality" (Rao, 2012).

Once again, however, multiple temporalities are at work here and these point to the contingencies of sexualized figurations of security. This is particularly true in the case of the figuration of the racially darkened and disabilized terrorist who is figured as undeveloped and undevelopable, stuck forever in time and incapable of progress. This

temporal figuration of the terrorist justifies violence against so-called terrorists in the name of security that would not be justifiable if development were possible.

Turning to performativities, we can see these sexualized figurations of security taken up and inhabited in at least three ways. First, many Western homosexuals have taken up the narrative of progress and development in an effort to access Western society – including, centrally, participation in Western militaries and state-recognized family life, via "homonationalism" (Puar, 2007), "homonormativity" (Duggan, 2003), and other diverse forms of LGBT or queer representation in contemporary militaries (Bulmer, 2012; Richter-Montpetit, 2014; Agathangelou, Bassichis & Spira, 2008). These figurations of sexuality with security in the military, also shape sexual and gender identities, practices and normativities (Crane-Seeber, 2016; Howell, 2014; Wool, 2015).

At the same time, other contemporary "homosexuals" find the narrative of progress oppressive or constraining. Those who reject this figuration object to institutions, structures of understanding, and practical orientations that value only hetero/homonormative ways of being "homosexual" (in marriage, the military, and consumption – see Duggan, 2003). Objections to narratives of homosexual inclusion in Western society as progress also center on the way this narrative enacts sexualized and racialized forms of worlding. For example, by excluding racially darkened people from homosexuality which is imagined as "progressive", "normal," white, or by justifying violence against "non-progressive," "perverse" racialized others. Conversely, some security practices are justified on the basis of a homosexualized other, as in US military interventions in various carribean states (Weber, 1999).

A third and related performative orientation to sexualized figurations of security involves exceeding the binaries assumed by those figurations. As in the men/women and masculinity/femininity examples above, homosexual/heterosexual and normal/perverse are often figured in binary ('either/or') opposition. Yet by paying attention to the specificity and contingency of figurations, we can see that this is not always the case. As Weber (2016) and Altman and Symons (2016) show through an analysis of the Eurovision winner Conchita Wurst, some subjects performatively inhabit both male and/or female, both normal and/or perverse, and both racially darkened and/or white European.

Each of these sexualized tropes, temporalities and performativities of security combine to produce sexualized forms of worlding. In addition to creating racist, colonial and patriarchal power relations in general (as described above), this worlding includes a sexualized global order in which 'good' and 'bad' states are mapped onto 'good' and 'bad' homosexuals. International relations, power and violence are then justified through sexualized figurations of security.

Overall, then, examining sexualized and gendered figurations of security not only the ways that sexuality is inextricably entwined with gender and security as well as race, it also shows the sexualized and gendered binaries at the heart of security logics. Further, this analysis troubles the stability of those binaries and shows how they might be or are exceeded.

Animate and inanimate, human and nonhuman

Turning to gendered, sexed and sexualized figurations of security as nonhuman or inanimate, we might ask who or what counts as gendered, sexed and sexualized in the first place. For example, might figurations of the material environment, such as South Asian and South American jungle or the Middle Eastern dessert, be understood as security threats? For each material environment is figured in gendered, sexualized and racialized ways to authorize a particular type of warfare against particular kinds of enemies like the guerrilla or terrorist (Povinelli, 2015). Similarly, the 'empty' melting Arctic has generated renewed security concerns around Arctic sovereignty. Historically, Arctic nations rushed to 'fill' the 'empty' Arctic with citizens to assert state sovereignty (Tester and Kulchyski, 1994). In Canada, making Indigenous people citizens – and thus securing Arctic sovereignty – meant attempting to assimilate them into Euro-Canadian gender, sexual and familial norms (Leigh, 2009). This further figured the perceived material environment with gender, sexuality and security as well as race and Indigeneity.

One of the most provocative examples of the material environment as a figuration comes from Elizabeth Povinelli's analysis of how a creek in northern Australia has become a contested figuration of security among Indigenous people, the Australian government and the mining industry (Povinelli, 2015; see also Povinelli, 2016). According to some of the Indigenous women who live near this creek, the creek used to be a girl, who turned into a boy, who turned into a creek. This means, Povinelli suggests, that some people might call *Tjipel* "transgender" or "butch", particularly in

the "contemporary fields into which her legs extend" (Povinelli, 2015:177).[3] The creek's gender is part of the version of the creek that these Indigenous women want to preserve. But Indigenous people must be careful about telling public stories about sexuality or gender because Indigenous people are themselves figured as racially darkened undeveloped perverse security threats by the Australian liberal state (Povinelli, 2015: 176). That means that Indigenous figurations of this creek might be used by the state to justify state claims to the creek.

What each of these examples demonstrates is that the security of the material environment can be gendered, sexed and sexualized. Below, we elaborate the example of the transgender creek to demonstrate how tropes, temporalities, performativities and worlding function in such figurations.

Povinelli's description of the Australian transgender creek, whose Indigenous name is *Tjipel*, illustrates how nonhuman and geological figurations of security function through tropes, temporalities, performativities and worldings. The lives of the Indigenous women in Povinelli's research are, in their account, inseparable from *Tjipel* and her gendered story because *Tjipel* determines much of what is possible for them. This includes in terms of fishing, foraging and connecting them with their

[3] The Indigenous women Povinelli describes do not (in her story) call the creek transgender or butch. While we often use the term 'gendered' in this chapter, we have chosen not to use the term 'transgendered' in this instance to reflect both Povinelli's careful situation of the term in those "contemporary fields" and the rejection of the word 'transgendered' by contemporary trans* activists.

mothers as well as other Indigenous communities via oral history. This makes it is difficult to see where *Tjipel*'s life ends and the lives of these Indigenous women begin. These women want to keep living with *Tjipel* in her current form. At the same time, some politicians, mining companies, and Indigenous representatives want to extract natural resources from *Tjipel*. Or they want to extract natural resources elsewhere in ways that would damage her or alter her current form.

Multiple tropes circulate are visible in Povinelli's description of the contestation over *Tjipel*. In the eyes of the Australian state, a trope of the authentic, traditional Indigenous person is a prerequisite for Indigenous legal rights to land. This in tension with another trope – the welfare-claiming, money-hungry lazy Indigenous person who would be too modern to have rights to land. At the same time, as we describe below, implicit in the traditional Indigenous trope is a fear for the security of the nation in the face of perverse Indigenous sexuality. *Tjipel* herself embodies further tropes. For mining companies and the Australian Government, the creek is an inanimate property-like resource. For the Indigenous women in Povinelli's research, however, *Tjipel* is an animate gendered figure.

Temporalities are central to these tropes. In the dominant Australian state narrative, the authentic and traditional Indigenous person endures from the past but is also fixed in time. Proof of temporal continuity is, in fact, a legal requirement for Indigenous claims to land on the basis of Indigeneity. The inauthentic Indigenous person has, however, progressed so far into modernity that they are no longer perceived as legitimately Indigenous. At the same time, the 'development' of *Tjipel* is seen as a civilized and civilizing move, in contrast to efforts to sustain the creek in her current

form. The mining companies and the Australian government are also seen as civilized and civilizing in progressive time, while *Tjipel's* Indigenous advocates are seen as temporally regressive.

Performativities are key to understanding the contestation over *Tjipel* as well as the creek herself. The Indigenous women who seek to maintain *Tjipel* in her current form must strike a careful performative balance. If Indigenous communities are not perceived to have properly "developed" – including in their gendered, sexual and familial arrangements – then the Australian state might claim authority over those communities or even attempt to destroy them in the name of "development", as settler-states including Australia have long done and continue to do (Wolfe, 2006). Thus being perceived to be perverse is a risk that the Indigenous women who seek to maintain *Tjipel* in her current form must avoid – and so, in Povinelli's account, they avoid telling *Tjipel's* full story. Yet if Indigenous people are perceived to have "developed" too much – to be inauthentic and non-traditional – then the Australian state might not recognize Indigenous rights or claims to land. This means that the Indigenous women who seek to maintain *Tjipel* in her current form must also performatively demonstrate their authenticity and tradition in order to stake a claim to *Tjipel*.

Through these tropes, temporalities and performativities, *Tjipel* becomes a site of multiple and contested worldings. The mining industry figures *Tjipel* – and land more generally – as an inanimate geological resource with potential market value. The Indigenous women who live with her figure her as part of a broader reciprocal relationship between humans and nonhumans. In these ways, the struggle over *Tjipel*

is a struggle over worlding: 'developing' *Tjipel* means extinguishing the world in which Indigenous people live in reciprocity with her, in favor of a world where industrializing capitalist humans relate to land as inanimate property (Povinelli). These worldings enact but also contest ongoing settler-colonialism in Australia.

Reading gendered, sexed and sexualized figurations of security as inanimate and/or nonhuman raises further questions for thinking about security more broadly. We might ask whether a geological formation can even be considered as a gendered figure – not just metaphorically but actually. Povinelli suggests that it is precisely by designating *Tjipel* as 'geological' that the security of the liberal state and Australian nation is protected against the threat of alternate Indigenous forms of worlding. We might also ask how, who, or what counts as a gendered and sexualized figuration more generally assumes a line between the 'biological' and the 'geological'. For example, how does that line designate proper objects and agents of security, and what worlds does it enable or work to extinguish? Finally, Povinelli's analysis raises the difficult question of who or what *does not* count as a gendered and sexualized figuration of security. The Australian state does not recognize *Tjipel* as a gendered and sexualized figuration and this functions to protect the state's security and the interests of extractive capital along with the tropes and worldings in which they are entangled. What else is not considered to be a gendered and sexualized figuration in the service of 'security'? What other gendered, sexualized, and geological figurations need not be made 'secure'?

Conclusion

Investigating sexed, gendered, and sexualized figurations of security by paying attention to tropes, temporalities, performativities and worldings offers four key insights about security. First, it demonstrates how sex, gender and sexuality are integrated into security concerns, while at the same time exposing the contingency, variability and complexity of those integrations. Second, it underscores the centrality of not just either/or but also and/or logics in theories and policies of sexed, gendered and sexualized security. Third, it expands the range of figurations that we might understanding to be sexed, gendered and sexualized in relation to security, from the human or animate to the nonhuman or inanimate. And it exposes how particularly state and corporate actors attempt to narrow this range of legitimate figurations, in the very name of security. Finally, all of these moves separately and together illustrate how sexed, gendered and sexualized figurations of security are always intersectionally produced and disputed and how these disputes can be central to contemporary formulations of power.

Bibliography

Agathangelou, A.M., Bassichis, M.D., Spira, T.L., 2008. Intimate Investments: Homonormativity, Global Lockdown, and the Seductions of Empire. Radical History Review 2008, 120–143. doi:10.1215/01636545-2007-025

Agathangelou, A.M., Ling, L.H.M., 2004. The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the Poisies of Worldism. International Studies Review 6, 21–49.

Allen, P.G., 1998. The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions. Beacon press, Boston.

Altman, D., Symons, J., 2016. Queer wars: the new global polarization over gay rights. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA.

Bulmer, S., 2013. Patriarchal Confusion?: MAKING SENSE OF GAY AND LESBIAN MILITARY IDENTITY. International Feminist Journal of Politics 15, 137–156. doi:10.1080/14616742.2012.746565

Butler, J., 1999. Gender trouble : feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge, New York.

Cohn, C., 1987. Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. Signs 12, 687–718.

Connell, R.W., 2005. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. Gender & Society 19, 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

Connell, R.W., Messerschmidt, J.W., 2005. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. Gender & Society 19, 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

Cornish, H., 2015. “Be polite, be professional, be prepared to kill” Counterinsurgency, masculinity and military doctrine (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Edinburgh.

Coulthard, G.S., 2014. Red skin, white masks: rejecting the colonial politics of recognition, Indigenous Americas. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Crane-Seeber, J.P., 2016. Sexy warriors: the politics and pleasures of submission to the state. Critical Military Studies 2, 41–55. doi:10.1080/23337486.2016.1144402

Duggan, L., 2003. The twighlight of Equality: neoliberalism, cultural politics and the attack on democracy. Beacon Press, Boston.

Duncanson, C., 2013. Forces for good?: military masculinities and peacebuilding in Afghanistan and Iraq. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Elshtain, J.B., 1995. Women and war, University of Chicago Press ed. ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Emberley, J., 1993. Thresholds of difference: feminist critique, native women’s writings, postcolonial theory, Theory/culture. University of Toronto Press, Toronto ; Buffalo.

Foucault, M., 1978. The history of sexuality. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.

Haraway, D.J., 1997.

Modest-Witness@Second-Millennium.FemaleMan-Meets-OncoMouse: feminism and technoscience. Routledge, New York.

Hendrickson, W.A., Ward, K.B., 1975. Atomic models for the polypeptide backbones of myohemerythrin and hemerythrin. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 66, 1349–1356.

Howell, A., 2014. The Global Politics of Medicine: Beyond global health, against securitisation theory. Review of International Studies 40, 961–987. doi:10.1017/S0260210514000369

Kuntsman, A., 2009. Figurations of violence and belonging: queerness, migranthood and nationalism in cyberspace and beyond. Peter Lang, New York.

Leigh, D., 2014. Post-liberal agency: decolonizing politics and universities in the Canadian Arctic (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Edinburgh.

Leigh, D., 2009. Colonialism, Gender and the Family in North America. Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism 9, 70–88. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9469.2009.01029.x

Peterson, V.S., 2013. The Intended and Unintended Queering of States/Nations: The Intended and Unintended Queering of States/Nations. Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism 13, 57–68. doi:10.1111/sena.12021

Peterson, V.S., 1999. Political Identities/Nationalism as Heterosexism. International Feminist Journal of Politics 1, 34–65. doi:10.1080/146167499360031

Povinelli, E.A., 2016. Geontologies: a requiem to late liberalism. Duke University Press, Durham.

Povinelli, E.A., 2015. Transgender Creeks and the Three Figures of Power in Late Liberalism. differences 26, 168–187. doi:10.1215/10407391-2880645

Puar, J.K., 2007. Terrorist assemblages: homonationalism in queer times, Next wave. Duke University Press, Durham.

Rao, R., 2012. On “gay conditionality”, imperial power and queer liberation. Kafila.

Richter-Montpetit, M., 2015. Beyond the Erotics of Orientalism: Homeland Security, Liberal War and the Pacification of the Global Frontier (PhD thesis). York University.

Simpson, A., 2014. Mohawk interruptus: political life across the borders of settler states. Duke University Press, Durham.

Sjoberg, L., Gentry, C.E., 2007. Mothers, monsters, whores: women’s violence in global politics. Zed Books, London.

Spivak, G.C., 1990. The post-colonial critic: interviews, strategies, dialogues. Routledge, New York.

St Denis, V., 2007. , in: Green, J.A. (Ed.), Making Space for Indigenous Feminism. Fernwood Pub. ; Zed Books ; Distributed in the USA exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan, Black Point, N.S.; London; New York; New York.

Tester, F., Kulchyski, P., 1994. Tammarniit (mistakes): Inuit relocation in the Eastern Arctic, 1939-63. UBC Press, Vancouver.

Weber, C., 2016. Queer international relations: sovereignty, sexuality and the will to knowledge, Oxford studies in gender and international relations. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Weber, C., 1999. Faking it: U.S. hegemony in a “post-phallic” era. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Wolfe, P., 2006. Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. Journal of Genocide Research 8, 387–409.

Wool, Z.H., 2015. Critical military studies, queer theory, and the possibilities of critique: the case of suicide and family caregiving in the US military. Critical Military Studies 1, 23–37. doi:10.1080/23337486.2014.964600

Yuval-Davis, N., 1997. Gender & nation, Politics and culture. Sage Publications, London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.